

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,650	03/19/2004	Michael Borns	25436/2382	9645
27495 75	90 07/20/2006		EXAMINER	
PALMER & DODGE, LLP			STAPLES, MARK	
	I. WILLIAMS / STR TON AVENUE		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON, MA	-		1637	
			DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/805,650	BORNS, MICHAEL	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Staples	1637	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence ac	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this of the calculation (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
·	 s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ters prosecution as to the	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•	5 11161 NO 10
Disposition of Claims		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
• 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application	<b>,</b>		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	•	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination (a) The description (b) filed are received as a second of the second of t			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	·	•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ,	<b></b> 4 4044 D
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	a Office Action or form P	10-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documen			
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		· ·	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	-	n received in this National	Stage
application from the International Burea		4	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies no	received.	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	1\ \[ \begin{align*} \tag{1} & \tag{2} &	Summon /DTO 442\	
2) Notice of References Cited (P10-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	• ——	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)

Art Unit: 1637

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121: Election within each group is also required, see Restriction Subgroups below.
  - I. Claims 1-30, drawn to methods for DNA synthesis, cloning, sequencing, amplification, and reverse transcriptase PCR at high pH comprising providing a DNA polymerase fusion, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
  - II. Claims 31-39, drawn to kits and compositions comprising a DNA polymerase fusion, classified in class 435, subclass 69.7.
- 2. The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the DNA polymerase fusion in Group II can be used in a materially different process than Group II; the DNA polymerase fusion can be as an antigen to generate antibodies. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a

separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

## Restriction Subgroups

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct Restriction Subgroups of the claimed invention. After election of one of the Groups above, Applicant is required to also elect a restriction subgroup. This is not a species election. Applicant will be required to cancel non-elected subject matter upon indication of allowable subject matter.

Each of the Groups I-II comprise a patentably distinct subgroup.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed Subgroup consisting of a **single** DNA polymerase fusion, with specific protein components and any substitutions or mutations being specified, for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the restriction subgroup that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly

Application/Control Number: 10/805,650

Art Unit: 1637

and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the Restriction Subgroups are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the Restriction Subgroups to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

## Notice of Possible Rejoinder

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

Art Unit: 1637

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

## **Conclusion**

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Staples whose telephone number is (571) 272-9053. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 1637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571) 272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Staples M Examiner Art Unit 1637 July 14, 2006

KENNETH R. HORLICK, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/17/06